

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

Abu Bakr Ladd,

Civil No. 4:05-CV-916 UNA

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER ON DISCOVERY OF
IN CAMERA MATERIALS**

St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners, et al.,

Defendants.

This matter came before the court, Magistrate Judge Arthur J. Boylan, U.S. Courthouse, 316 No. Robert St., St. Paul MN 55101, on plaintiff's motion to compel defendant to provide answers to interrogatories. An Order on Motion to Compel was issued on May 15, 2007, therein requiring that defendant produce internal affairs documents, including files in the possession of the St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners, to the court for *in camera* review. The materials have now been submitted to the court. Plaintiff is represented by Anser Ahmad, Esq. Defendants are represented by Dana C. Ceresia, Esq., Assistant Missouri Attorney General.

Based upon the court's *in camera* review of the submitted documents,¹ including St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners internal affairs records, along with all the files and records in this case, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that disclosure of materials submitted for *in*

¹ The documents were submitted to the magistrate judge with a cover letter from defendant's counsel dated June 26, 2007. The materials contained several black out redactions as well as some omitted text. Thereafter, the court directly contacted defendant's counsel to determine whether unredacted documents could be obtained. By letter dated July 2, 2007, the court was advised that the files had been submitted as received by counsel, and there are no additional documents or pages that might have been removed for any reason other than normal document retention policy. In reviewing the materials the court finds no reason to infer that inclusion of redacted or missing information would render the documents relevant or likely to lead to discovery of admissible evidence.

camera review is not required. The court finds that neither the documents themselves nor information contained therein are relevant to issues in the case and the court further finds that the discovery is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1).

Dated: July 20, 2007

s/ Arthur J. Boylan
Arthur J. Boylan
United States Magistrate Judge